
Minutes

Board of Natural Resources

December 3, 2002

Natural Resources Building, Olympia, Washington

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands
Bruce Bare, Dean, University of Washington, College of Forest Resources
James Zuiches, Dean, Washington State University, College of Agriculture and Home Economics

PARTICIPATED BY PHONE

Bob Nichols for Governor Gary Locke

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Glen Huntingford, Commissioner, Jefferson County
Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sutherland called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. on Tuesday, December 3, 2002, in Room 172 of the Natural Resources Building.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bruce Bare suggested the following editorial changes as a friendly amendment to the November 5, minutes:

PAGE 13 -

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Line 8 | include the word “capital” before budget |
| Line 10 | replace the word lands with ”assets” |
| Line 12 | under point 2) include “operating” before budget |
| Line 14 | include “at least” before 10% |
| Line 30 | replace the word regions “regents” |
| Line 35 | replace the word value with “purpose” |

MOTION: Jim Zuiches motioned to approve the November 5, 2002, Board of Natural Resources Meeting Minutes.

SECOND: Bruce Bare seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously including the friendly amendment.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AGENDA ACTION ITEMS

Mike Mahafa - Citizens Group Opposing Tango Timber Sale (Handout 1)

Mr. Mahafa is part of a concerned citizens group of the Tango timber sale. He indicated that his group attended a public notification meeting held in February 2002. At that meeting the group expressed their concern and a small number of them formed their own working group of six or eight people, to determine what local interest there may be in the management of the Tango timber trust. The group has met with legislators, and provided the Board with several letters from local supporters. The group would like the Board to consider revising the Tango timber sale. They are not opposed to the logging of the tract, they understand the obligation to the trusts and good stewardship but they suggested other options for the Board to consider:

- 1) Economic concerns to harvesting the timber now. Why do a clear cut before the Sustainable Harvest has been calculated? What if it is determined that it would be better to cut 5, 10, or 15 years out?
- 2) Science concerns as to how the SEPA document was written. This is a unique tract of land and has been well managed by DNR in the past, but there are about 60 bird species that may be at risk especially the Pileated Woodpecker. There is concern that there may be a significant impact to the streams due to clear cutting, even with the buffers.
- 3) There is no statement in the SEPA document as to how the logging will affect the homeowner's well systems or septic systems.
- 4) Aesthetic will affect the homeowners and their property value.
- 5) The group would like to develop a partnership with the Department in working through these concerns. They would like to see some other uses and alternatives for this land that will satisfy DNR's obligations, the Board's obligations, and benefit the local citizens.

Ron Myers - Citizens Group Opposing Tango Timber Sale (Handout 2)

As a retired science teacher, Mr. Myers supports the use of DNR forests to produce funds for the construction of schools but is concerned that it be done in a manner to insure long term revenue that causes no harm to its potential as a forest or to adjacent property. One of Mr. Myers's concerns is his well water that comes from a shallow aquifer dependent on the watershed provided by this forest. It currently produces only a little over 5 gallons per minute. If the forest is clear-cut, the more rapid runoff of rain will increase the risk of his well going dry by the end of a dry summer. Also, part of the value of his home is its setting by the woods and a clear-cut would diminish that.

Jacquie Houghten - Citizens Group Opposing Tango Timber Sale (Handout 3)

Ms. Houghten indicated that her group is not clear on the status of the proposal and what exactly the Board is proposing? She also asked what became of the public comments that were given? She expressed the group's disappointment in the lack of public relations from DNR. The group has concerns for the migratory birds, the wetlands, and the wildlife. They are opposed to the clear-cut and feel it will destroy the trails their children use for scouting and biking, and instead propose a selective cut. She suggested DNR has not fully assessed nor addressed local and regional economic, social, and environmental values and focused their decision on the timber harvest only. The group recommends that the Board reject the current Tango timber proposal and that the DNR be directed to start this process over, then invite us to participate in the process.

Sandra Pennell – Citizens Group Opposing Tango Timber Sale (Handout 4)

Ms. Pennell encouraged the Board to see this area as a needed park-like setting that many local children use because there are no parks in the area. Local citizens are looking for an area that the local children can help steward and help them establish a sense of value for nature, and these forests are a perfect

location. Several groups are interested in this area and have offered to provide community services for the area.

TIMBER SALES

Marketing Update (Handout 5)

Jon Tweedale, Product Sales Manager, informed the Board that he attended a symposium where he spoke to an industry group and transportation experts in the field of forestry and forest products. He shared some highlights from the symposium (Slide 3):

Panel Tech is a corporation that produces a web technology that overlays onto plywood blanks which is then sold with various forms of the overlays. This is a very different value added company in the industry. They also have a second business they refer to as a Log Rail Network, which is a transportation mode that rails logs to distant locations. Within the existing transportation network today, distant supply is a large component.

Mill curtailments - Louisiana Pacific permanently shut down a large mill in Montana due to supply tension in that region. Simpson Timber in Shelton is curtailing Mill 5, Mill 3, and possibly more. There is a lot of tension due to the wood coming in from Canada and the excess supply.

Mill expansions - high cost mills going out of business and low cost mills are coming into business. CR Pacific in Grays Harbor and Simpson Tacoma mills are very efficient. We are seeing fewer mills but bigger mills.

Rail transport - key to integrating marketing approach in the future.

Mr. Tweedale addressed a question raised at a prior meeting regarding DNR's appraisals. The question - Why is the stumpage return so much lower than other appraisals? Mr. Tweedale provided a high-level discussion of the elements that go into an appraisal and looked at a comparison of two sales (Slide 4).

Bruce Bare asked at what point stumpage market value is not economical to pursue?

Mr. Tweedale referred to a trend analysis he had prepared and in his report he had trend numbers on Hemlock and Douglas fir over the long-term. At this time we are at, or barely above, trend on Douglas fir and above trend in Hemlock so in the bigger picture, the stumpage for Hemlock is above trend on average. If we go below trend by 5 or 10% return then we should ask what's enough and when do we hold back? As we move into our portfolio analysis we will be able to look more closely at those numbers.

Mr. Tweedale continued with the November sales results (Slide 7): 23 sales were offered with 58 million board feet; achieved \$290 per-thousand board foot; there were three no-bid sales; the average number of bidders was 4.

Chair Sutherland asked Mr. Tweedale to explain the no-bid sales.

- 1) The Kendall Red sale - The purchasers perceived that the timber sale cruise volume was off from DNR's so we will look at those numbers again and reappraise the sale. It will be re-offered in the Spring.
- 2) The Macro sale - The region received feedback that there were high road costs that could have been a factor. They are looking at reducing the road costs through redesign.
- 3) The Start Up sale - Some purchasers felt the appraisal was too high so it will be looked at again and brought back in February.

Proposed Timber Sales For January 2002 (Handout 5)

Mr. Tweedale highlighted the proposed timber sales for January (Slide 9) indicating 21 sales at 63.8 million board feet, \$15.4 million dollars worth for \$241 dollars a thousand. He then asked how the Board would like to proceed.

Chair Sutherland suggested that the Board review all but the Tango sale.

Jim Zuiches referred to the maps included in the timber sales packets and pointed out some fairly proximate clear-cuts to the scheduled sales and after reviewing the SEPA it became clear that in many cases the adjacent cuts were 6 to 8 years old and in some cases it was a 0 to 5 year plantation. He asked Mr. Tweedale to remind the Board of the green-up policy and how that kind of proximity is dealt with?

Mr. Tweedale indicated that in general the adjacent stand has grown up to a minimum of four feet in five years and that is a basic rule that we follow.

Jim Zuiches questioned whether one could make the assumption that a 5 to 6 year stand will be 5 to 6 feet tall?

Mr. Tweedale said yes, that's standard but they still do ground checks.

Bruce Bare asked the difference between a partial cut and a seed-tree (Sale #1 & Sale #5)?

Mr. Tweedale said a partial cut is considered a thinning and a seed-tree is for a regeneration harvest. The definitions were provided to the Board previously but Mr. Tweedale agreed to distribute the definitions again.

Chair Sutherland asked that the discussion now be directed to the Tango timber sale. He indicated the sale is located in Clark County, it is a regeneration cut, and has four Units. The sale complies with HCP and Forest Practice Rules. He then introduced Ray Lasmanis.

Ray Lasmanis, Southwest Region Manager, indicated that he is responsible for the Tango timber sale and he also introduced his key staff members, Jim Shank, the district forester, and Ann Johnson, the sale coordinator. Mr. Lasmanis informed the Board that Mr. Shank would be presenting the information regarding the Tango sale.

Mr. Shank began by stating the sale was common school trusts. It was recognized early on that neighborhood concerns would need to be incorporated into the sale, which is a process DNR always addresses when there are residents in the area. DNR sent letters to the adjacent landowners inviting them to a neighborhood outreach meeting. There were about 28 attendees. The notes from that meeting were incorporated into the design and the contract language for the sale. Many of the attendees requested site visits and those were arranged. The concerns expressed during those site visits were primarily about aesthetics and attempts were made to mitigate those concerns. We also responded to letters, phone calls, and SEPA comments. The contract, which incorporated neighbor comments and concerns, is available through public disclosure. Below are mitigations implemented into the contract addressing concerns:

NOISE LEVEL

There are timing restrictions in place (7am to 5pm, no weekend or holidays).

STREAM ISSUES

DNR biologists and the Department of Fish & Wildlife provided input on these mitigation efforts.

The buffer (exceeds Forest Practices regulations for Type 3 water) is an average of 173' to 190' on each side of the stream (the Type 4-waters receive a 100 foot buffer each side under our HCP guidelines).

DNR engineers worked with the foresters to design one stream crossing across Type-3 water. To limit the impact to that stream, DNR worked with Fish & Wildlife and incorporated a timing on that entry so crossings are limited to June 15 thru October 15, which is low flow.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Operators are not to block any county roads.

Flaggers and signs are required if they have any activities near the roads.

Road approach permits were acquired through Clark County Public Works Department.

GARBAGE DUMPING ACCESS

At conclusion of harvest, the roads will be blocked immediately.

RECREATIONAL TRAILS

During the harvest DNR will be doing some rehab to the trails.

Some of the work is being done now.

FOREST DIVERSITY

The cedar component will be left to provide seed source.

All woody debris on the ground over 30-inch in diameter will be left.

POWER LINES

Working closely with PUD to avoid power line problems associated with harvest activities.

Chair Sutherland asked when the contract would be available without the public needing to go through the public disclosure process?

Ms. Johnson indicated that the contracts cannot be distributed until the Board approves the sale in case the Board requests changes in the contract. If the Board approves the sale then the contract and most of the site-specific issues will be found in the H-140 clause.

Chair Sutherland asked if the normal review with Fish & Wildlife took place regarding the concerns over the various species of birds?

Mr. Shank indicated that DNR's region biologist received the landowner's list and divided the different species mentioned on the list into categories and responded back in her report, which is attached to the SEPA document. That report states that a high percentage of the species identified would be using the riparian area, which will be intact after harvest. There would also be leave clumps that would provide cover and corridors for big-game species. Regarding Fish & Wildlife, DNR worked with them primarily in the Type-3 crossing and concerns related to that issue.

Chair Sutherland brought up earlier comments about the Federal Migratory Bird Act (FMBA) and whether the flow of those birds would be interrupted during harvesting.

Ms. Johnson clarified that the FMBA is specific to water fowl and Tango is not habitat for water fowl however the FMBA does provide ancillary habitat to upland species through the riparian areas around what is typical water fowl habitat and our riparian areas provide the same kind of ancillary benefits for the upland birds that would be migrating through. There are some large riparian areas being left such as the area north of Morgan Creek in Unit 1 a Type-3 stream, which is not going to be harvested at this time, this is a 7 or 8-acre area.

Mr. Shank mentioned that state-ownership is approximately 240 acres and on the briefing sheet the planning area that we started with was 141 acres. There is a 60 acre forested area to the west of Unit 1 that wasn't in the original planning area and still remains.

Bruce Bare read from some of the citizen's letters, which stated they wanted the department to continue the excellent stewardship of the Tango area as in the past, and another statement, to manage the Tango tract as in the past i.e., selective harvesting, not removal of 90% of the canopy. Mr. Bare wondered if there had been other harvesting activity in the past such as thinnings.

Mr. Shank stated there had been no other harvesting. There had been blow-down entries in the mid-90's associated to a disease pocket but this was not an extensive entry.

Jim Zuiches asked what the slope in the grade is in Unit 1 in particular?

Mr. Shank indicated that Unit 1 is flat, but Units 2 & 4 are flat in some areas and as you near the riparian area there is a 30 to 40% slope.

Jim Zuiches clarified the reason he asked the question and stressed that the intent of this sale is for a regeneration harvest, not to turn it into agricultural lands, and the flatness of the area could indicate that. He then asked if the leave trees clumps were Douglas fir or cedar?

Mr. Shank answered that the clumps are primarily Douglas fir and those are tagged. There are also about 400 marked trees throughout the units and they are targeted as wildlife trees pointed out by the biologists.

Jim Zuiches suggested that this shows an attempt to deal with the aesthetic concerns by leaving a buffer along the road and the agricultural lands.

Chair Sutherland brought up the citizen's concerns over public relations with the neighbors. He asked how Mr. Shank would describe this timber sale compared to other typical harvest activities?

Mr. Shank described the exceptional attempt to gain contact with the local citizens and stated that every call received was responded to promptly. Numerous visits were made and even return visits one on one. We were timely with responses, and offered to do site visits.

Mr. Tweedale added that the comment period was extended though it did not have to be. Staff chose to do that to ensure all concerns were heard and addressed.

Mr. Lasmanis added that his staff did a good job up front in laying out the sale. He feels that this situation demonstrates that DNR transition lands, where urbanization surrounds the lands, and the cost of doing business, in terms of staff time and addressing public concerns, is a cost that we have to bear. As we look at the transition lands we should weigh the benefits of divesting ourselves of those lands vs. the cost of managing them for timber production.

Chair Sutherland added that DNR will continue to have these interface difficulties as people move near forest areas anticipating that the land will remain a park-like setting.

Chair Sutherland then asked when the earliest harvest activity would take place?

Ms. Johnson said 10 days after the sale the purchaser can begin harvest within the timing restriction specific to the sale.

Chair Sutherland asked how long it would take for the harvest to be completed?

Mr. Shank indicated that usually DNR concludes its contracts two years from the sale date.

Chair Sutherland wanted to know how soon would they replant?

Mr. Shank said we usually replant in February or March and we try to get the trees back in the ground within a year although we have two years in case there is a need for site preparation. The reforestation trees are already ordered from the nursery. Douglas fir is the anticipated replacement and for the disease pockets western red cedar has been selected because it is resistant to root rot.

Bruce Bare brought up an earlier comment about the Pileated Woodpecker and it was stated that “these comments were dismissed” as these species were able to relocate and remain on site and the statement was made that there was not scientific fact to support that statement.

Mr. Shank responded that the biologist could not find the nesting structures that could support that other than in the riparian areas, which are buffered.

Bruce Bare also brought up an earlier concern about wells and septic draining systems on private lands.

Ms. Johnson indicated that there is no record of this occurring in the area. There are other developments taking place and Ms. Johnson has been watching those SEPA's very closely and this has not been an issue.

Bruce Bare indicated that the SEPA document did not address the potential economic losses and aesthetic value for homeowners and asked if that was required?

Ms. Johnson said it is not required, but what DNR did detail in the SEPA is that this sale meets the county's growth management plan for that area and states that the replanting would assure that this land remains forestland at this time.

Bruce Bare pointed out the concerns from the citizens didn't seem to be whether a harvest takes place but how the trees will be harvested. He asked whether it was considered to leave the trees spaced out rather than in clumps?

Mr. Shank indicated that the silviculturalist assessed the area and found that wind-throw and root structures indicated the need to clump as much as possible to buffer the trees as they may fall during strong windstorms.

Jim Zuiches pointed out that given the briefing document information and the recommendations that staff have made, it seems clear that many of the concerns raised by the community have been addressed. He noted that this is a working forest and as such, there is the expectation of harvest, and through that

process the needs of the community are taken into account. He commended the mitigation efforts and accredited the staff for doing the kind of job that the community would expect.

Chair Sutherland requested that as this harvest moves forward, that DNR staff continue to work with the neighbors to keep them apprised of the situation. He also asked that once the harvest is complete, that the neighbors are invited to be involved in the reforestation activities as well as determining recreational opportunities for the area.

MOTION: Jim Zuiches moved to approve the proposed timber sales for January 2003.

SECOND: Bruce Bare seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Break 11:10

Reconvened 11:25

NOTE: Bob Nichols departed via phone during the break.

CHAIR REPORTS

Legislative Inquiry

Chair Sutherland asked the Board to recall the October 24, letter received from Representatives Doumit, Kenney, and Chopp discussing the obligation relating to stewardship of lands. DNR staff has been preparing a response to that letter as well as a report that was due to the legislature today. Chair Sutherland asked Bonnie Bunning, Executive Director of Policy and Administration, to provide an update on the status.

Ms. Bunning recapped the three specific areas that the Board was asked to provide opinion on:

- 1) Selling trust lands and depositing the proceeds into permanent funds or other financial instruments.
- 2) Diversifying trust land holdings to increase returns to the trusts.
- 3) Cashing out certain trust lands and transferring the lands to a new trust such as the proposed legacy trust.

Bruce Bare referenced the letter from the three representatives explaining that the information provided conflicted somewhat as to who (DNR or the Board) is responsible for what?

Chair Sutherland's interpretation of the request from the legislators is for the Board to act, although concurrent with the discussions by the department. The report from the Board is due in January.

Bruce Bare asked what the plan is?

Chair Sutherland said they will finish the budgetary responses and DNR has notified OFM that it is coming. The Board needed to be aware of the process to eliminate possible replication in the process of the two directions to the department and the Board.

Jim Zuiches interpreted the letter a bit differently in that he thought the department had the responsibility to prepare the reports and submit them, and the Board was to review the reports and be part of the discussion with the legislature as they consider new options during the next legislation.

Chair Sutherland conveyed his intent to bring a draft copy of the response to the Board for review and to have the Board sign off on it, then forward it to the legislature indicating that the Board did have a discussion and came to a conclusion.

Jim Zuiches said the only question he had in reviewing the documents was related to the statistics from 1991 and some of them looked anomalous. He wondered if it was an increase in timber sales or a reduction in timber sales? He indicated that DNR was going to check those numbers.

Ms. Bunning confirmed that they are checking those numbers.

Bruce Bare indicated that several of the tables say 1989 thru '02 and others are 1989 thru '01. When trying to compare numbers, that can make it difficult. He also pointed out that in Table 5, (Replacement Trust Acquisitions – Page 19) it says that of the 39,000 acres acquired, almost 38,000 were of forest. In value, the commercial (which is only 45 acres) is 69 million whereas the 38,000 of forest is only 56 million, so on a value basis there has been some diversification out of forests but on acres it hardly looks like we are diversifying. He indicated that there was a point in the back where it needs to be clear whether it's diversification in value or diversification in acres.

Chair Sutherland stated that there are two parts, the diversification in value and the diversification in revenue income. A lot of money can be spent on commercial properties and not get return on the investment so what we are trying to show is that we are diversifying not only on value but the significant return on investments.

Bruce Bare pointed out pages with discrepancies:

PAGE 20 (second paragraph) there is a reconciliation problem with some numbers. It states since 1989, 112 million in replacement trust property has been purchased and going back to Table 5 the replacement property is 127 million.

PAGE 25 shows when contrasting the market value approach vs. the investment value, the wording became cloudy such as "market value" and "investment value" then a sentence stating "market investment analysis" and "market appraisals" making it difficult to determine which was being addressed.

PAGE 26 has a computer model (BareInt 9.1) referenced but no explanation is given to what it is or what the Board should determine about it.

PAGE 32 talks about agriculture lands acquisitions, risk was brought up but there was no mention of risk in earlier discussions of forestland acquisitions on Page 24.

Bruce Bare also asked how the department would develop the recommendations with the beneficiaries?

Ms. Bunning said she has been meeting with the beneficiaries. She also agreed to follow-up on the discrepancies and reminded the Board that this report is in the draft stage and input is appreciated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR GENERAL ITEMS OF INTEREST

Becky Kelley - Washington Environmental Council WEC (Handout 7)

Discussed a publication she received "Science Finding" and wanted to share it with the Board and distributed the most recent issue. She shared a couple of pieces in the publication that she felt were relevant to the sustainable harvest calculation and quoted "moderate extension of rotations combined

with thinning would increase both volume production and value production while mitigating many of the conflicts between timber production and other values.” Ms. Kelley requested that while the EIS is being written, and there is some down time, that the Board has a presentation on thinning so they can study the topic in preparation for the decisions to come this summer. She then asked how much thinning the HCP envisions to reach those targets or other goals such as habitat for the spotted owl? She also indicated that in the last several months, it appears that there are fewer thinnings and more clear-cut, and wondered if the foresters are moving away from thinning because of the short term cost issues. She stated that it would be good for the Board to have a discussion on that as well. She also wanted to know if anyone has looked at social measures and employment levels for foresters and loggers for longer rotations and thinnings vs. shorter rotations and no thinnings. Finally, she would like to hear from DNR regarding some of the values of thinning for wildlife.

Chair Sutherland informed Ms. Kelley that DNR staff does receive this publication.

Bob Dick - American Forest Resource Council AFRC (Handout 8)

Commented on the Vaagen Brothers Mill closure in Republic. It was a big-log mill and DNR needs big-log mills to process the large trees in this state. The need will increase as you increase the longer rotation ages. He then discussed comments on Whatcom Lake.

There are three principles to be considered as you make decisions on Whatcom Lake:

- 1) Substance - large area (15,000 acres) and has a significant impact on timber and revenue production.
- 2) Process - previous Commissioner disallowed involvement in the process they worked so hard for.
- 3) Opportunity - review process uncovered significant water quality issues unrelated to forest management, but which can be mitigated, in part by forest management. Good forestry and high water quality can be a good fit.

Marcy Golde - Washington Environmental Council WEC

Expressed concern about earlier discussions with the Tango timber sale group. They brought a positive proposal with responsible alternatives for the Board to consider but the Board did not respond to the proposal. She suggested the need to think in greater depth about thinning and to respond to citizens differently in the future.

Rob Kavanaugh - Retired Citizen (Handout 10)

Expressed his concerns for the Central and Eastern Washington ranges. He commended DNR staff for their good efforts and their cooperation, however the challenge they face is the lack of resource allocation to do the good science and good management controls that ensure long-term viability. He passed out some photos and maps that indicate the damage being done by overgrazing. He referenced a WENAS CRM indicating that severe overgrazing was found. He asked that an in-house evaluation be done on the condition of these rangelands. He suggested the department build interdisciplinary teams with existing staff who can come out and help the range managers. He commended Mr. Brown, the district manager in Klickitat County for excellent forestry and used it as a good example. Mr. Kavanaugh also mentioned the Bull Trout decline.

Chair Sutherland informed Mr. Kavanaugh and the Board that the department is aware of this issue and invited Milt Johnston to speak about the status.

Milt Johnston, Assistant Region Manager for Southeast Region, his focus on Agricultural Lands Management, provided a map of DNR agriculture lands and described the variety (Handout 9). He addressed CRM's (Coordinated Resource Management), which DNR is very active in and participates in a lot of them. The WENAS CRM is an area southwest of Ellensburg and encompasses three townships

and three owners, DNR, F&W, and private ownership. So there is a tremendous cooperative effort. In addition, there are three lessees. From the range professional's point of view, this is not an overstocking issue it is a distribution issue. DNR's standards are that we don't want over utilization in the riparian areas and that is an area of concern and needs to be worked on in the future. The CRM is working on this.

Chair Sutherland asked what kind of product is the CRM putting together?

Mr. Johnston said he will work in concert with other participants to work out where DNR wants to go with future grazing and distribution. It is a voluntary effort, so a product is undetermined at this time.

Chair Sutherland asked if F&W have active leases for grazing purposes?

Mr. Johnston said yes.

Bruce Bare asked if the five areas that Mr. Kavanaugh pointed out were DNR ownerships?

Mr. Johnston said DNR has a sliver of ownership but the majority is private ownership.

Bruce Bare wondered if Mr. Kavanaugh's criticism should be directed at other landowners as well. His criticism was directed at the Board and DNR. He asked what DNR's and the Board's obligation is to monitoring non-DNR land within the CRM and if that's appropriate?

Mr. Johnston said DNR is working cooperatively with the CRM with all of the participants but has no obligation nor should DNR be monitoring activities on other lands. DNR wants to take the leadership role and all objectives are the same, but the limitation is resources and time. This is not an excuse but a reality.

Chair Sutherland thanked Mr. Johnston and asked that he come back in May or June to provide an update. He also commented on the map that was handed out and stressed his concern about managing land with this type of ownership pattern. Chair Sutherland has had conversations with F&W about this issue and they have indicated a willingness to have serious discussions about that.

Chair Sutherland asked if there was anyone else present wishing to make comment before the Board? Seeing none, hearing none. Meeting was adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

NOTE: (Handout 11) written public comment from Mr. Dale Arola who is in favor of the Tango Timber Sale. Mr. Arola provided his comments immediately following Board meeting.

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2003

Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands

Bob Nichols for Governor Gary Locke

Bruce Bare, Dean, University of Washington

James Zuiches, Dean, Washington State University

Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Glen Huntingford, Commissioner, Jefferson County

Attest:

Maureen Malahovsky, Board Coordinator